

February 1, 1973

it could become just a routine, rather than any meaningful thing, but I do get concerned, I can recognize the feeling that the new members, that perhaps all too frequently the burden of proof seems to be on those who oppose the bill for it's enactment or motion, rather than the burden of proof being on the introducer and the proponent of why a change is needed, another alternative which is discussed for example, is the partisan legislature, but whether or not this would provide the adversary position, some instances I'm sure that it would, in other instances a great many of the bills are merely a judgement matter in which a partisan position would be in difficult if probably not impossible to accomplish. Now again I've only offered the motion not as a proposed rule change, which I know would have been the appropriate way to go, but I frankly don't have an appropriate motion in mind, a rule change to accomplish this, and I've made the motion in this basis hoping that the members who may have ideas would either pass them on to a member of the rules committee or come to a rules committee meeting or perhaps use these normal procedures of developing the rule and submitting it through the normal procedure, but I think that we need to be concerned, that we can keep personal feelings to a minimum and I recognize they can not be totally excluded, but we ought to try and keep the discussion on issues basically upon the merits, because there is bound to be philosophical differences, there is no question of the strength of the legislative body, and in fact the legislative body is only effective when there is disagreement. If all 49 of us agreed on everything, every-time, I don't believe the saporous of the citizens of the state of Nebraska would be well served. This

(End of Belt #7)